

~~SECRET~~033-0188
Copy 2 of 8

19 March 1959

MEMORANDUM FOR : Deputy Director (Plans)

THROUGH : Acting Chief, DPD

SUBJECT : Evaluation of Reconnaissance Proposals
for GUSTO

25X1A5a1

1. Final proposals for reconnaissance equipment for GUSTO were received from [REDACTED] during the week of 1 March 1959. Also received was a paper from EK outlining an old strip Camera system that warrants little or no consideration for the GUSTO program.

2. All of the above proposals have been evaluated by Hqs. staff members, as indicated, and personnel of the Photographic Intelligence Center. Although Hqs. personnel used Memo. GUS-0110, Subject: Reconnaissance Guidelines for GUSTO, dtd 29 January 1959 in their evaluation, PIC considered the proposals only on the basis of photographic intelligence suitability.

3. It should be noted that although the Reconnaissance Guidelines for GUSTO were used in Hqs. evaluation no factors are given on Attachment #1 for the [REDACTED] and ELINT portions, but are discussed below.

4. [REDACTED] - P&E's approach to the [REDACTED] problem seems to be far advanced to that of the other contractors. They have indicated the feasibility of a system working in the [REDACTED] Overall average evaluation of [REDACTED] system based on factors such as: Feasibility; sensitivity; simplicity and compactness; reliability; previous experience of contractor in design and manufacture of [REDACTED] equipments are:

25X1D

25X1D
25X1D

25X1D

25X1D

25X1D

25X1D

25X1A5a1

2	4	1	No proposal submitted
---	---	---	-----------------------

25X1D

In view of the above, it now seems that it might be desirable to consider the [REDACTED] equipment as a separate package with a view toward obtaining additional proposals and obtaining the equipment under separate contract.

~~SECRET~~

25X1A

25X1A9a

25X1A

5. MLINT - Although potential reconnaissance sensor contractors were made aware of the possible utilization of MLINT equipment on all GUSTO flights and the allocation of approximately 12% for this gear, they (the contractors) were not asked or required to submit proposals for MLINT. Only ITEK attempted to approach this problem but only from a concept standpoint. During the ITEK meeting of 6 March 1959, [REDACTED] was questioned regarding their MLINT write-up. The resultant opinion of Hqs. staff personnel was, our [REDACTED] personnel had a greater understanding of the problem and should be given the responsibility and authority to develop the MLINT gear for GUSTO. As you are aware, [REDACTED] submitted a proposal on 26 January 1958, entitled "Proposed MLINT System for Project CHALICE" (CHAL-0540). This memorandum was submitted after a number of conversations between [REDACTED] and Hqs. staff personnel.

25X1A5a1

25X1A5a1

25X1A

6. In evaluating the photographic system each item on Attachment #1 was considered separately and given a numerical value to indicate the suitability of the item. Although a scatter-gun approach was used by some of the contractors in some of the proposals the system recommended by the contractor was the one evaluated. They are:

25X1A

- a. P&E, Figs. 12 and 13, Attachment #3
- b. ITEK, Fig. III-B-1, Attachment #4
- c. [REDACTED] Fig. 2, Attachment #5

7. The P&E proposal is extremely well done and represents the product of a great amount of advanced thinking as well as a considerable amount of engineering effort in order to come up with a system that is sophisticated and well planned. This system, without doubt, has the greatest growth potential and can be scaled up or down to allow maximum utilization of the air frame selected.

8. The ITEK proposal is for a well planned system which considered many of the items covered by the P&E study. However, with scale and resolution less than that of the P&E system it is felt this system could only be second best.

25X1A5a1

9. Even though [REDACTED] as all other contractors, had several meetings with Hqs. personnel during the weeks prior to submitting their final proposal, they seem to have given little thought to isolating the principal problems involved. It is felt they would experience considerable trouble meeting the requirements of the GUSTO program.

10. Headquarters Staff personnel at all times attempt to keep abreast of all developments in the reconnaissance field; however, they have not, to date, conducted a special investigation to determine if there are any parallel developments for photographic reconnaissance equipments similar to those proposed for GUSTO. The selection of contractors to submit proposals was made to represent a good cross section of the aerial reconnaissance field, allowing us to take advantage of any and/or all developments that might be underway.

11. In view of the above and the findings on Attachments #1 and #2, it is recommended that F&S be selected as the contractor to furnish the photographic equipment for GUSTO.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]
Major, USAF

ATTACHMENTS

25X1A

- 1 - Neg Eval.
- 2 - PIC Eval.
- 3 - RAE, GUS-0152, cy 2
- 4 - ITIK, GUS-0166, cy 2, w/ltr
- 5 - [REDACTED] GUS-0153, cy 3
- 6 - EX, DPD-1513-59, cy 1

CONCURRENCES:

[REDACTED]

RAS, DPD

[REDACTED]
OPS, DPD

APPROVED:

[REDACTED]
RICHARD M. BISSELL, JR.Deputy Director
(Plans)

25X1A9a

DPD-30/P: [REDACTED] :pf

Distribution:

Orig - DPD/P
 ✓ 2 -
 3 - Acting Chief, DPD
 4 - Mr. E. Kiefer
 5 - Chief [REDACTED]
 6 - OPS [REDACTED]
 7 - RAS [REDACTED]
 8 - Chrono, GUS

25X1A